

Chapter 17: Historic, Archaeological, and Paleontological Resources

17.1	Regulatory Setting.....	17-2
17.1.1	Laws and Regulations	17-2
17.1.2	Agencies, Tribes, and Their Roles	17-6
17.2	Affected Environment.....	17-8
17.2.1	Resource Identification Methods	17-8
17.2.2	Resources in Salt Lake County	17-14
17.2.3	Resources in Utah County.....	17-26
17.3	Environmental Consequences	17-32
17.3.1	Methodology	17-32
17.3.2	No-Action Alternative.....	17-33
17.3.3	Salt Lake County Alternatives	17-33
17.3.4	Utah County Alternatives.....	17-39
17.3.5	Mitigation Measures.....	17-42
17.3.6	Cumulative Impacts	17-42
17.3.7	Summary of Impacts	17-42
17.4	References	17-44

This chapter describes the known historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources located within the area of potential effects for each alternative under consideration in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Historic and archaeological resources are defined as those physical manifestations or remains of past human activity that are at least 50 years old. To account for the amount of time that will likely elapse between the identification of cultural resources as part of this EIS and the implementation of any project decision, the age for resources to be considered historic or archaeological was decreased to 45 years.

In this chapter, the term *architectural properties* refers to buildings that are at least 45 years old (constructed before 1959). The term *archaeological resources* refers to sites, features, and structures that are at least 45 years old and are composed primarily of non-architectural elements. Such archaeological resources include everything from prehistoric campsites to historic railroads and canals. *Paleontological resources*, often referred to as fossils, are defined as the remains, traces, or imprints of ancient organisms preserved in or on the earth’s crust that provide information about the history of life on earth.

Cultural Resources Impact Analysis Area (Area of Potential Effects). The impact analysis area for the cultural resources analysis consists of the area that was visually inspected for cultural resources. The impact analysis area is

comparable to the area of potential effects (APE) as defined by 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800.16(d), which defines an APE as “the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties [cultural resources that are listed on or are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places], if any such properties exist.” The APE for the Mountain View Corridor (MVC) project consists of the proposed footprint for each alternative, including all direct disturbances that could result from constructing the roadway and interchanges, relocating utilities, and placing right-of-way fences or sound walls, and the area immediately adjacent to this footprint that could be affected by such things as vibration or changes to the historical setting and feeling of a cultural resource.

The cultural resources impact analysis area is described in greater detail in Section 17.2.1.3, Field Inspections, and is shown in Figure 17-1 through Figure 17-4, Archaeological and Historic Building Survey Areas. This area was defined in consultation with representatives of the Utah State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). Over the course of studies conducted for this EIS, the APE changed as transportation alternatives under consideration were refined based on public and agency scoping comments and in response to the identification of potentially sensitive resources. The impact analysis area, or survey area, for architectural resources was expanded to match all changes in the APE. The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), in consultation with the Utah SHPO, determined that the impact analysis area for archaeological resources did not need to be expanded in a similar fashion because field inspections for these resources were already being conducted at a reconnaissance (sample) level, and the changes in the APE were not substantive enough to affect the validity of that sample.

17.1 Regulatory Setting

A series of federal and state laws mandate the consideration of potential impacts on historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources. State and federal agencies, as well as Native American tribes, are responsible for implementing these laws.

17.1.1 Laws and Regulations

Table 17.1-1 below lists the major cultural resource laws and regulations that apply to the MVC project. Individual laws or regulations of particular importance to the project are discussed in more detail following the table.

Table 17.1-1. Cultural Resource Laws and Regulations that Apply to the Mountain View Corridor Project

Title	Applicable Regulation(s) or U.S. Code (U.S.C.)	Year Enacted
American Antiquities Act	16 U.S.C. 431–433; 43 CFR 3	1906
National Historic Preservation Act	16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.; 36 CFR 800	1966; amended 1980, 1992, 1999, 2000
Executive Order 13007: Indian Sacred Sites Order	NA	1966
Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f)	49 U.S.C. 303; 23 CFR 771.135	1966; amended 1983
National Environmental Policy Act	42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.; 40 CFR 1500	1969
Executive Order 11593: Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment	NA	1971; codified as part of the 1980 amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act
Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act (Moss-Bennett Act)	16 U.S.C. 469–469c	1974
American Indian Religious Freedom Act	42 U.S.C. 1996	1978
Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act	25 U.S.C. 3001–3013; 43 CFR 10	1990
Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments	NA	2000
Utah State Antiquities Act	UCA 9-8-404	1992; amended 1998, 2002, and 2005
Archaeological Resource Protection Act	16 U.S.C. 1997	1979
Protection of Paleontological Resources	UCA 63-73-19	1995
Utah Code Annotated (UCA) 9-8-404	UCA 9-80404	Amended 2006
NA = not applicable		

17.1.1.1 Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act was enacted to assess impacts to historical and archaeological resources that could be affected by undertakings involving federal agencies. Paleontological resources are also given consideration under this Act. The Act requires federal agencies that fund, permit, or are otherwise involved in a project (for example, as a landowner) to consider the impacts that the undertaking would have on cultural resources. The Act mandates that agencies perform the following actions:

- Make an effort to identify historic properties that could be affected by a project, including historic and archaeological sites that either are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or have been determined through a consensus process to be eligible for listing on the NRHP.
- Assess the nature and extent of the expected impacts on the qualities of the resource that resulted in its listing on the NRHP or the determination that it was eligible for listing on the NRHP.
- Consider measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate those impacts.

36 CFR 800, commonly referred to as the Section 106 regulations, outlines the process through which the above actions are carried out. This process includes steps for consulting with state and/or tribal historic preservation officers, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Native American tribes, and other interested parties. State-level antiquities laws give similar considerations to historic and archaeological resources in Utah.

Table 17.1-2 below illustrates the Section 106 process and the status of that process with regard to the MVC project.

Table 17.1-2. Outline of the Section 106 Process and Status for the MVC Project

Step	Status
Initiate Section 106 Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish undertaking. • Identify appropriate SHPO/Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO). • Plan to involve the public. • Identify other consulting parties. 	Complete.
↓	
Identify Historic Properties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine scope of efforts. • Identify historic properties. • Evaluate historic significance. 	Complete for EIS Process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope determined. • Identification surveys for EIS complete.^a • Evaluations of known resources complete.
↓	
Assess Adverse Effects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply criteria of adverse effect. 	Complete for Known Properties. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of Effect on Known Historic Properties complete in consultation with SHPO.
↓	
Resolve Adverse Effects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue consultation. 	To Be Completed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programmatic Agreement or Memorandum of Agreement to be executed.
^a Additional intensive-level archaeological and paleontological surveys of the preferred alternative will need to be completed before construction. For the EIS process, a reconnaissance-level survey was completed; this survey was designed so that at least 30% of the area encompassed by each alternative was visually inspected for archaeological and paleontological resources.	

17.1.1.2 Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 gives special consideration to cultural resources that are either listed on or eligible for listing on the NRHP. Section 4(f) is discussed in detail in Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation.

17.1.1.3 Tribal Consultation

Federal legislation such as the National Historic Preservation Act and Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, mandates that federal agencies involved in a project that could affect resources of importance to Native American tribes must consult with those federally recognized tribes when the location of the federal undertaking is within an area of traditional use for the tribe. This consultation is to occur at a government-to-government level in recognition of the sovereign status of the tribes.

The goal of the consultation is to identify resources of importance to the affected tribes, to assess the nature and extent of the impact on the characteristics of the resources that make them important, and to work through a collaborative process to identify acceptable measures for avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating significant impacts to the resources. Other laws, such as the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, mandate additional consultation with tribal governments if human remains, burial goods, or items of cultural patrimony are identified in association with a federal project.

17.1.1.4 Paleontological Resource Considerations

Paleontological resources are given consideration and protection under a variety of laws and regulations. Among the federal laws is the American Antiquities Act, which refers only to “objects of antiquity” but has been frequently interpreted to include paleontological resources. Additionally, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) also require consideration of impacts to paleontological resources. In addition to federal legislation, the State of Utah has also enacted legislation (Utah Code Annotated 63-73-19) that requires avoidance or minimization of impacts to paleontological resources on projects with state involvement. As part of this state-level legislation, UDOT entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Utah Geological Survey for the purpose of consultation to identify known or potential paleontological localities of importance that could be affected by UDOT’s projects and to consider measures to avoid or minimize those impacts.

17.1.2 Agencies, Tribes, and Their Roles

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is the lead federal agency in the environmental review process for the MVC project. As a federal agency, FHWA must comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, which requires all federal agencies to take into account the effects of their projects on historic properties. In addition, as an agency within the U.S. Department of Transportation, FHWA is required to comply with Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, as amended, which protects historic properties as well as parklands, recreation areas, and refuges.

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation is the federal agency responsible for overseeing compliance with Section 106. Typically, the Council does not participate directly in the Section 106 consultation process for a specific project. However, the Council must be notified of federal agencies’ determinations at key milestones, and the Council has the right to enter the consultation process based on criteria listed in the Section 106 regulations. If the Council elects to participate in consultation, the Council’s approval is required for any Memoranda

of Agreement or Programmatic Agreements for the project. The Council also may participate in resolving disputes between federal and state agencies or project proponents that might arise regarding the management of historic and archaeological resources within the area of effect of a project.

As applicants seeking federal approvals, UDOT and the Utah Transit Authority (UTA) help FHWA develop the documentation needed for the Section 106 process and participate extensively in that process as consulting parties. UDOT and UTA also help FHWA address the requirements of Section 4(f). In addition to their roles under these federal laws, UDOT and UTA also must comply with the antiquities and preservation laws and policies of the State of Utah, which are generally similar to federal policies.

The Utah Division of State History is the state agency responsible for the oversight of cultural resource management in Utah. The Division of State History includes the State Historic Preservation Officer and the State Archaeologist as well as architectural historians, preservation planners, managers of archaeological and historic site records, and cultural resource and preservation specialists. Under the Section 106 regulations, the Utah SHPO is a consulting party on all projects that require compliance with federal preservation laws. He or she also serves as a consulting party for projects that must comply solely with state preservation laws.

Native American tribes with patrimonial claims to the area within which a federal project is planned are entitled by law to be included in Section 106 consultation as consulting parties. The tribes with patrimonial claims may identify specific historic or archaeological sites, prehistoric or ethnographic human remains/burials, natural resources such as landforms or landscape features, or other resources such as viewsheds as having importance to the maintenance of cultural traditions, ideologies, or religious values among present-day members of their tribes. If such resources are identified, agencies must take impacts to these resources into consideration when planning and implementing projects.

17.2 Affected Environment

17.2.1 Resource Identification Methods

The identification of historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources that could be affected by any of the alternatives under consideration was carried out using a multi-pronged approach. This approach consisted of:

- Literature reviews
- Field inspections
- Consultation with agency experts, city and county personnel, Native American tribes, and members of the general public with specific information about cultural and paleontological resources in the impact analysis area for cultural resources

This approach is described in greater detail in the technical reports produced in support of this EIS (Easton, Stokes, and Hutchinson 2005; Ellis 2007a, 2007b).

Resources that were identified through any part of the multi-pronged approach described above were evaluated for their eligibility for listing on the NRHP. The evaluations consisted of assessing each known resource relative to the criteria of the NRHP. These criteria are as follows (36 CFR 60.4):

- A. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; *or*
- B. Is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; *or*
- C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; *or*
- D. Yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Cultural resources that meet one or more of the above criteria are considered eligible for listing on the NRHP. Such resources must also possess sufficient integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association in relation to the NRHP criterion under which it would be listed.

17.2.1.1 Literature Review

Literature reviews included examination of the project, site, and historic architectural records of the Utah SHPO. Copies of records for historic and archaeological sites known to be present within or directly adjacent to all proposed alternatives were obtained. The NRHP and lists of state and local

landmarks were consulted for information regarding resources that might be present within the boundaries of each alternative. Additionally, published literature regarding the prehistoric and historic uses and the known geological composition of the area was reviewed to determine whether paleontological resources would be affected by the proposed alternatives.

17.2.1.2 Consultation

As part of the effort to identify historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources in the impact analysis area, Section 106 consultation was carried out between UDOT, UTA, FHWA, FTA, and several agencies and individuals. Among those agencies consulted were the Utah SHPO (both the Preservation and Antiquities Departments), the Utah Geological Survey, the Bureau of Land Management (Salt Lake Field Office), and the Utah National Guard at Camp Williams.

Local Governments and Historical Societies

In addition to the agencies, consultation was undertaken with several other entities with direct interest in historic or archaeological resources that could be affected by the proposed alternatives. Agencies with direct jurisdiction over lands within or adjacent to the proposed alternatives were also consulted. These entities included certified local governments (CLG), historical societies and organizations, and mayors or town councils where no CLG or historical society exists. The following groups were contacted by letter, invited to become consulting parties for the project, and invited to provide information about cultural and/or paleontological resources of importance to their communities or organizations:

- American Fork CLG, Mrs. Juel Belmont
- Bluffdale CLG, Mr. Denny Neilson and Mrs. Gloria Neilson
- Herriman, Mayor J. Lynn Crane
- Lehi CLG, Mr. John Rockwell
- Magna Township, Town Council
- Riverton Historical Society, Mrs. Karen Bashore
- Salt Lake City CLG, Ms. Elizabeth Giraud
- Salt Lake County CLG, Mr. Clair Hardman
- South Jordan History Committee, Mr. Joey Clegg
- Utah County CLG, Mrs. Donna Breckenridge
- Utah Heritage Foundation, Mr. Kirk Huffaker
- West Jordan, Mayor Bryan Holladay
- West Valley City, Mayor Dennis Nordfelt



Consultation with the Utah SHPO, the Utah Geological Survey, mayors, and tribes focused on soliciting information about the known or potential presence of both historic/archaeological and paleontological resources in the areas that could be directly or indirectly affected by the proposed alternatives. Consultation between UDOT and FHWA and the Utah SHPO focused on defining the appropriate APE and on methods for identifying resources that would be appropriate for this EIS.

None of the agencies, mayors, or CLG representatives identified any specific cultural or paleontological resources of concern in the impact analysis area. Additionally, none of these parties accepted the invitation to become consulting parties. For this reason, only the Utah SHPO is a consulting party for this project.

Individuals and Community Organizations

Several individuals and nonpolitical, community-based organizations were contacted for information about resources in the impact analysis area. These efforts were intended to help identify resources that are important to individual communities. The individuals and organizations included the newly created Magna Historical Society as well as city planners and city engineers with both Magna Township and West Valley City (which does not have a formal historical society). Efforts were made to contact individuals in Lehi and northern Utah County, but these efforts were unsuccessful.

None of the individuals and organizations contacted during this consultation effort identified any important historic sites or potential conflicts between the proposed alternatives and ongoing or planned preservation efforts in the impact analysis area or requested to be consulting parties for the project.

Native American Tribes

In addition to the agencies, communities, and organizations mentioned above, the following six Native American tribes with patrimonial claims over the general project area were also consulted (Molenaar 2006):

- Confederated Tribes of Goshute Reservation
- Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation
- Paiute Tribe of Utah
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
- Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians
- Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Tribe

Tribes who requested copies of the technical reports produced for this EIS were provided with such documents for their review and comment. A field visit to



examine the locations of the proposed alternatives was also conducted. Participants in this field visit included a representative from the Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation, UDOT, FHWA, and the EIS consultant. No traditional cultural places were identified through the field visit or any other aspect of the consultation with Native American tribes. However, the Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation asked to continue to be informed of the project's progress; requested that a Programmatic Agreement or other type of formal agreement be executed between UDOT, the Utah SHPO, FHWA, and interested tribes to guide future phases of work related to additional studies and implementation of any action alternative(s); and asked that they be notified of any discoveries of prehistoric resources or human remains during construction (Molenaar 2006). They did not request to be a consulting party for the project.

The Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Tribe stated that they did not require any further consultation on the project, and the Confederated Tribes of Goshute Reservation and the Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians did not respond to any attempts at consultation (Molenaar 2006). The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes received a copy of the technical reports for review, but did not provide any comment and did not request to be a consulting party for the project.

17.2.1.3 Field Inspections

Two types of field inspections were conducted to identify historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources that could be affected by the proposed alternatives. The first type of inspection focused on identifying architectural properties (buildings), and the other type focused on identifying archaeological and paleontological resources. The second type of inspection identified resources that were visible on the ground. Field staff did not try to identify any subsurface (buried) resources. The methods for each type of field inspection were determined in consultation with the Utah SHPO.

The inspection for architectural properties was conducted as a selective reconnaissance-level survey in accordance with the Utah SHPO's guidelines. The survey area consisted of a series of corridors and block areas encompassing the area of potential effects for each alternative under consideration. As alternatives were refined and adjusted during the scoping and alternatives development processes, additional areas were inventoried for architectural resources to ensure that all locations within the final alignments of each alternative carried forward for analysis were inspected.

Selective reconnaissance-level surveys are designed to target only historic properties, as opposed to standard reconnaissance-level surveys, which target all architectural properties (both modern and historic) within a given area. Selective

reconnaissance-level surveys are designed for use in areas where the number of historic properties is small compared to the number of modern properties.

As part of the selective reconnaissance-level survey conducted for this EIS, all properties with primary buildings or a significant collection of outbuildings that were estimated to have been built before 1960, and through which any portion of a proposed alternative passed, were documented. Each primary building or significant collection of buildings was assessed for the degree to which it retained its original historic design and condition in accordance with the Utah SHPO's guidelines regarding the assessment of architectural properties.

- Buildings that retained a high level of historical integrity were considered to be eligible for the NRHP under both Criterion A for their association with and reflection of periods of significance in the area's historic development (that is, their association with important local events in history) and Criterion C for their being representative of architectural types and local architectural trends.
- Buildings that had been sufficiently modified so that they no longer represented the characteristics of particular architectural types and trends but retained sufficient integrity to represent their association with the general historic development patterns of the area were considered eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A.
- Buildings that had a low level of historic integrity were considered ineligible for the NRHP unless specific knowledge of past important historic associations for the building was identified.

The technical reports produced for the selective reconnaissance-level surveys of the alternatives in both Salt Lake and Utah Counties contain greater detail about the procedures used to identify, document, and evaluate architectural properties (Ellis 2006a, 2006b, 2007a, 2007b).

The field inspections for archaeological and paleontological resources were also conducted at a reconnaissance level. Through consultation with the Utah SHPO, UDOT and FHWA determined that performing a pedestrian (walk-through) survey of 100% of each proposed alternative was neither cost-effective nor necessary for the purpose of planning-level alternative comparisons in this EIS. Instead, a survey strategy using evenly spaced transects (narrow strips) was designed so that at least 30% of the area encompassed by each alternative was visually inspected for archaeological and paleontological resources. That is, transects were spaced such that a total of 30% of the width of each survey corridor, as measured in a series of 50-foot-wide parallel strips running the length of the survey corridor, were inspected for archaeological and paleontological

resources. *Technical Memorandum 14, Archaeological Resource Assessment Plan*, details these survey methods. More intensive field inspections for archaeological and paleontological resources would be conducted before construction if an action alternative is selected as a result of this EIS. More information about these future studies is provided in Section 17.2.1.4, Next Steps.

Following the completion of the field inspection for archaeological and paleontological resources, the alignments of the alternatives to be carried forward for detailed analysis were refined, and in several locations they were shifted away from those areas inspected during the reconnaissance-level field inventory. Through consultation with the Utah SHPO, UDOT and FHWA determined that the survey data constituted a valid sample survey of the area of potential effects for the purpose of assessing the impacts of each alternative on archaeological and paleontological resources. For this reason, no additional field inspections for these resources were conducted. Figure 17-1 through Figure 17-4, Archaeological and Historic Building Survey Areas, show the portions of the various alternatives that were inventoried for archaeological and paleontological resources.

Note that areas within each alternative that either were covered with asphalt, concrete, or other paving or were located within developed and landscaped front and rear residential yards were not inspected for archaeological and paleontological resources. The inability to gain access rights from the landowner prevented field inspection of the ATK Alliant property, through which portions of several Salt Lake County alternatives pass. Greater detail on the methods used for the field inspections for archaeological and paleontological resources can be found in the technical report (Easton, Stokes, and Hutchinson 2005).

17.2.1.4 Next Steps

Efforts to identify cultural resources, evaluate them for listing on the NRHP, and assess impacts to them from the proposed alternatives will continue throughout the preparation of the EIS and prior to construction if an action alternative is selected in the Record of Decision for the MVC project. These efforts will include (1) continued consultation with the Utah SHPO, Native American tribes, and other interested parties; (2) development of a Programmatic Agreement or Memorandum of Agreement between UDOT, FHWA, the Utah SHPO, and Native American tribes who have requested to be a party to such an agreement to outline mitigation measures for adversely affected cultural resources and establish protocols for responding to inadvertent discoveries; and (3) an intensive-level pedestrian archaeological and paleontological survey of the selected alternative (if an action alternative is selected) prior to construction. The

▲ ▲

exact timing of the intensive-level survey would be determined in consultation with the Utah SHPO and outlined in the Programmatic Agreement or Memorandum of Agreement.

17.2.2 Resources in Salt Lake County

The literature reviews, consultation, and field inspections identified historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources within the impact analysis area in Salt Lake County. These resources range from prehistoric and historic archaeological sites to historic canals and railroads to architectural properties. No paleontological resources were identified within the area of potential effects in Salt Lake County.

17.2.2.1 Architectural Properties

A total of 112 architectural properties were identified within the impact analysis area in Salt Lake County (see Table 17.2-1 below). These properties, most of which are residential, include structures from the late 1800s to the middle 20th century. All of the properties were identified in the area between 2100 South and 4700 South and between roughly 5600 West and 7200 West in Magna and West Valley City. No architectural properties were identified outside this area.

Of the 112 architectural properties identified in Salt Lake County, 47 are considered to be eligible for the NRHP and 65 are considered to be ineligible. The locations of the eligible properties are shown in Figure 17-5 through Figure 17-7, Architectural Properties. UDOT's and FHWA's NRHP eligibility determinations were made in consultation with the Utah SHPO (see Appendix 17B, Cultural Resources Correspondence, for a copy of the Determination of Eligibility/Finding of Effect signed by the Utah SHPO).

▼ ▼

Table 17.2-1. Architectural Properties Associated with the Salt Lake County Alternatives

Address^a	Construction Date (Estimated)	Description	National Register Eligibility
5610 W. 2700 S.	1950	World War II (WWII)–Era Cottage exhibiting general Post-WWII style; constructed of striated brick; one contributing outbuilding	Eligible under Criteria A and C
5666 W. 2700 S.	1924	Residence of undefined type exhibiting vernacular Victorian style; clad in stucco/plaster; former farmstead; unique structure; four contributing and one non-contributing outbuildings	Eligible under Criterion A
5764 W. 2700 S.	1914	Cross-Wing (L-cottage) residence of undefined style; clad in aluminum/vinyl siding; full-length porch enclosed; multiple large additions obscure original form; two non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
5770 W. 2700 S.	1905	Rectangular Block residence exhibiting vernacular Victorian style; clad in asbestos siding; porch glassed in; one non-contributing outbuilding	Eligible under Criterion A
5790 W. 2700 S.	1915	Bungalow residence of indeterminate style; clad in narrow vinyl siding; addition on façade; enclosed porch; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
7230 W. 3100 S.	1945	WWII-Era Cottage exhibiting general 20th Century style; clad in medium-width aluminum siding; aluminum-frame double-hung windows; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
7235 W. 3100 S.	1935	Period Cottage residence exhibiting general Period Revival style; clad in modern brick; out-of-period bay window; porch addition; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
5712 W. 3500 S.	1940	WWII-Era Cottage (with garage) residence of Minimal Traditional style; constructed of regular brick; storm windows over original; one contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
5724 W. 3500 S.	1930	WWII-Era Cottage of Minimal Traditional style; clad in stucco/plaster; three contributing outbuildings and one contributing rock wall; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criteria A and C
5741 W. 3500 S.	1890	Foursquare residence exhibiting general Classical and Greek Revival style; clad in asbestos siding; no outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criteria A and C
5742 W. 3500 S.	1915	Bungalow residence of general Bungalow style; constructed of regular brick; farmstead; five contributing outbuildings, one non-contributing outbuilding and historic trees; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criteria A and C
5755 W. 3500 S.	1940	WWII-Era Cottage exhibiting Minimal Traditional style; constructed of striated brick; original windows; one non-contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criteria A and C
5765 W. 3500 S.	1930	WWII-Era Cottage exhibiting Minimal Traditional style; clad in asbestos siding; in-period addition; one non-contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
5769 W. 3500 S.	1940	WWII-Era Cottage exhibiting Minimal Traditional style; clad in asbestos siding; windows replaced; one non-contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A

▲ ▲

Address ^a	Construction Date (Estimated)	Description	National Register Eligibility
5880 W. 3500 S.	1955	Ranch/Rambler residence exhibiting general Ranch/Rambler style; constructed of regular brick; out-of-period addition on east side; three non-contributing outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
5890 W. 3500 S.	1920	Bungalow residence exhibiting Period Revival and general Bungalow style; constructed of regular brick; three non-contributing and one contributing outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
5910 W. 3500 S.	1945	WWII-Era Cottage exhibiting Minimal Traditional style; constructed of striated brick; one contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
5920 W. 3500 S.	1940	WWII-Era Cottage exhibiting Minimal Traditional style; clad in asbestos siding; windows replaced; no outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
5944 W. 3500 S.	1930	Bungalow residence of general Bungalow style; clad in clapboard siding; false front applied; no outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
5950 W. 3500 S.	1940	Cape Cod residence exhibiting Colonial Revival style; clad in vinyl siding; remodeled; no outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
6891 W. 3500 S.	1950	Early Ranch (with garage) residence of general Early Ranch style; constructed of striated brick; one non-contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criteria A and C
6900 W. 3500 S.	1950	Service Station of general Post-WWII style; constructed of regular brick with aluminum/vinyl siding; significantly altered; no outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
6921 W. 3500 S.	1955	Ranch residence (with garage) of general Ranch/Rambler style; constructed of regular brick; no outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criteria A and C
6965 W. 3500 S.	1900	Hall-Parlor residence of general Classical style; clad in aluminum/vinyl siding, which alters appearance significantly; no outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
6987 W. 3500 S.	1957	Bungalow residence exhibiting vernacular Colonial Revival style; clad in aluminum/vinyl siding; no outbuildings; relocated to present site from Garfield, Utah; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
6997 W. 3500 S.	1940	WWII-Era Cottage of Minimal Traditional style; clad in aluminum/vinyl siding; no outbuildings; relocated from Bacchus facility in 1956; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
7015 W. 3500 S.	1950	Early Ranch residence (with garage) exhibiting general Post-WWII style; clad in asbestos siding; garage addition; one contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A

▼ ▼

Address ^a	Construction Date (Estimated)	Description	National Register Eligibility
7319 W. 3500 S.	1880	Central Block with Projecting Bays residence exhibiting Victorian-Era Queen Anne style; constructed of regular brick; no outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criteria A and C
7329 W. 3500 S.	1920	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow and Minimal Traditional style; clad in clapboard siding; no outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criteria A and C
7339 W. 3500 S.	1870	Hall-Parlor residence exhibiting general Classical style; clad in asbestos siding; no outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criteria A and C
7372 W. 3500 S.	1940	WWII-Era Cottage of Minimal Traditional style; clad in asbestos siding; windows replaced; one non-contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
7376 W. 3500 S.	1920	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow style; constructed of regular brick; side addition; one non-contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
7385 W. 3500 S.	1930	WWII-Era Cottage of 20th Century Other style; clad in vinyl siding; windows replaced; no outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
7459 W. 3500 S.	1920	Bungalow residence exhibiting Arts and Crafts style; clad in asbestos siding; windows altered; no outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
3567 S. 5600 W.	1930	Residence of undefined type featuring vernacular Period Revival styling; clad in drop siding; two contributing outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
3581 S. 5600 W.	1940	WWII-Era Cottage of Minimal Traditional style; clad in shingle siding; a chimney appears to have been added on to the north end of the building; one non-contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
3601 S. 5600 W.	1927	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow and Colonial Revival style; clad in clapboard siding; four contributing outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
3602 S. 5600 W.	1900	Cross-Wing residence exhibiting vernacular Victorian Eclectic styling; constructed of regular brick; one contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
3611 S. 5600 W.	1938	WWII-Era Cottage of Minimal Traditional style; clad in asbestos siding; one non-contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
3627 S. 5600 W.	1920	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow and Arts and Crafts style; clad in aluminum/vinyl siding; no outbuildings were noted; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
3630 S. 5600 W.	1923	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow and Prairie School style; constructed of regular brick; one non-contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A

▲ ▲

Address ^a	Construction Date (Estimated)	Description	National Register Eligibility
3639 S. 5600 W.	1890	Side Passage/Entry residence of Victorian Eclectic style; constructed of regular brick; exhibits multiple additions and the porch has been enclosed; no outbuildings were noted; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
3653 S. 5600 W.	1940	WWII-Era Cottage of Minimal Traditional style; clad in asbestos and shingle siding; no outbuildings were noted; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
3663 S. 5600 W.	1900	Foursquare residence of vernacular Victorian Eclectic style; clad in drop siding; two contributing outbuildings, including a stone granary; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
3672 S. 5600 W.	1942	Cape Cod residence exhibiting general Post-WWII style; clad in cobblestone veneer; 13 contributing outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
3685 S. 5600 W.	1955	Ranch residence with an attached garage and exhibiting general Early Ranch style; clad in shingle siding; the garage has been enclosed to create additional living space; no outbuildings were noted; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
3690 S. 5600 W.	1930	Residence of undefined type exhibiting vernacular Bungalow and Period Revival style; clad in stucco/plaster; no outbuildings were noted; moved to present location prior to 1960; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
3691 S. 5600 W.	1955	Early Ranch residence with an attached garage exhibiting Early Ranch style; constructed of regular brick; the garage has been enclosed to create additional living space; no outbuildings were noted; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
3732 S. 5600 W.	1910	Central Block with Projecting Bays residence exhibiting vernacular Victorian Eclectic style; clad in drop siding; five contributing outbuildings, including a stone and wood barn, are located on the property; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
3750 S. 5600 W.	1944	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow style; constructed of regular and striated brick; no outbuildings were noted; moved to the present location in 1968; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
3775 S. 5600 W.	1955	Ranch residence with an attached garage and exhibiting general Ranch/Rambler style; constructed of regular brick; no outbuildings were noted; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
3784 S. 5600 W.	1910	Hall-Parlor residence exhibiting general (early) 20th Century style; clad in vinyl siding; several windows in the façade have been altered; no outbuildings were noted; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
3809 S. 5600 W.	1926	Bungalow residence of general Bungalow style; clad in asbestos and masonite siding; no outbuildings were noted; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible

▼ ▼

Address ^a	Construction Date (Estimated)	Description	National Register Eligibility
3827 S. 5600 W.	1925	Bungalow residence of general Bungalow and Clipped Gable Cottage style; constructed of regular brick; no outbuildings were noted; moved to present location after January 1972; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
3846 S. 5600 W.	1917	Bungalow residence of general Bungalow style; constructed of regular brick; 12 contributing outbuildings; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
3853 S. 5600 W.	1907	Bungalow residence exhibiting vernacular and Victorian Eclectic stylings; clad in asbestos siding; one non-contributing outbuilding; remodeled after WWII; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
3870 S. 5600 W.	1955	Early Ranch/Rambler residence exhibiting Early Ranch style; constructed of regular brick; one contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
3879 S. 5600 W.	1940	WWII-Era Cottage of Minimal Traditional style; clad in asbestos and vinyl siding; garage addition; no outbuildings were noted; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Not Eligible
3917 S. 5600 W.	1923	Bungalow residence of general Bungalow style; constructed of regular brick and partially clad in stucco/plaster; one non-contributing outbuilding and four contributing outbuildings, including a concrete granary; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criterion A
4095 S. 5600 W.	1950	Ranch residence with an attached garage and exhibiting general Ranch/Rambler style; clad in shingle siding; one contributing outbuilding; documented for the UDOT 3500 South Project ^b	Eligible under Criteria A and C
3525 S. 5750 W.	1920	Foursquare residence of vernacular Victorian style; clad in asbestos siding; storm windows over some original windows, other original windows replaced; one contributing outbuilding (garage); moved to this location in 1940s from Garfield, Salt Lake County, according to property owner	Eligible under Criterion A
3530 S. 5750 W.	1947	Early Ranch/Rambler residence exhibiting Minimal Traditional style; clad in clapboard siding; modern vinyl windows; one non-contributing outbuilding	Eligible under Criterion A
3539 S. 5750 W.	1956	Early Ranch residence of Early Ranch style; clad in aluminum siding and imitation stone; alterations include use of aluminum siding, the removal of porch posts/ supports, the replacement of original windows, and general deterioration; two non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
3546 S. 5750 W.	1947	Residence of undefined type exhibiting general Period Revival style; clad in synthetic stucco; fenestration altered; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
3547 S. 5750 W.	1956	Early Ranch residence exhibiting Early Ranch style; clad in medium-width aluminum siding; alterations include replacement of original windows and the application of aluminum siding; two non-contributing outbuildings	Eligible under Criterion A

▲ ▲

Address ^a	Construction Date (Estimated)	Description	National Register Eligibility
3555 S. 5750 W.	1925	Cross-Wing residence of vernacular Greek Revival style; clad in medium-width aluminum siding; alterations include the replacement of all original windows, the application of aluminum siding, a possible rear (side) addition and multiple other additions; the building exhibits an odd orientation with the entry wall perpendicular to the frontage road, suggesting a significant change in the setting and approach for this building over time; no outbuildings were observed	Not Eligible
3556 S. 5750 W.	1952	Ranch/Rambler residence exhibiting general Ranch/Rambler style; clad in asbestos siding; in-period garage addition; no outbuildings	Eligible under Criterion A
3565 S. 5750 W.	1937	Early example of WWII-Era Cottage exhibiting general Early 20th Century style; clad in narrow aluminum siding; alterations include the application of the narrow aluminum siding, the replacement of all original windows, and the modification of the breezeway roof leading to the detached garage; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
3568 S. 5750 W.	1957	WWII-Era Cottage of indeterminate style; clad in narrow aluminum/vinyl siding; fenestration altered and windows replaced; out-of-period garage addition; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
3569 S. 5750 W.	1957	WWII-Era Cottage of indeterminate style; clad in narrow aluminum/vinyl siding; fenestration altered and windows replaced; out-of-period garage addition; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
3584 S. 5750 W.	1927	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow style; clad in modern brick and wood sheet; metal roof; porch enclosed; two non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
3590 S. 5750 W.	1937	Period Cottage exhibiting Greek Revival and general Period Revival style; constructed of striated brick and partially clad in asbestos siding; clay tile roof; some windows replaced; rare style; no outbuildings	Eligible under Criterion A
2573 S. 7200 W.	1915	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow style; clad in stucco/plaster and wood sheet; large out-of-period side addition; façade windows in-filled; porch partially enclosed; three non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
2627 S. 7200 W.	1949	WWII-Era Cottage residence of indeterminate style; clad in narrow aluminum siding; large out-of-period side addition; porch enclosed; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
2635 S. 7200 W.	1917	Other residential type of indeterminate style; clad in narrow aluminum siding; multiple out-of-period additions; modern vinyl windows; no outbuildings	Not Eligible
2641 S. 7200 W.	1935	WWII-Era Cottage (Period Cottage transitional form) of general 20th Century style; clad in narrow aluminum siding; vinyl windows; no outbuildings	Not Eligible
2647 S. 7200 W.	1935	WWII-Era Cottage of indeterminate style; clad in drop siding; fenestration altered; front door relocated to out-of-period side addition; no outbuildings	Not Eligible

▼ ▼

Address ^a	Construction Date (Estimated)	Description	National Register Eligibility
2650 S. 7200 W.	1923	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow style; clad in medium-width aluminum siding; in-period side addition; dormer window covered; two non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
2710 S. 7200 W.	1906	Hall-Parlor residence of indeterminate style; clad in vinyl siding; multiple additions; fenestration altered—front door relocated; three non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
2958 S. 7200 W.	1957	Ranch/Rambler residence exhibiting general Ranch/Rambler style; clad in narrow vinyl siding; windows replaced; two non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
2982 S. 7200 W.	1925	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow style; constructed of regular brick; porch enclosed; aluminum- and vinyl-frame windows; undergoing exterior remodel at time of documentation; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
2992 S. 7200 W.	1952	Ranch/Rambler residence exhibiting Late 20th Century style; clad in wood sheet, modern brick, and stone veneer; poor condition; out-of-period brick veneer which extends off of building to create a fence; possible garage addition; no outbuildings	Not Eligible
3040 S. 7200 W.	1952	WWII-Era Cottage exhibiting general Post-WWII style; clad in aluminum/vinyl siding and imitation stone; probable out-of-period second-story addition; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
3044 S. 7200 W.	1959	Ranch/Rambler residence exhibiting general Ranch/Rambler style; constructed of oversized brick; major out-of-period garage addition; no outbuildings	Not Eligible
3052 S. 7200 W.	1945	Residence of indeterminate type and style; clad in narrow vinyl siding; major out-of-period second-story addition; probable fenestration change; no outbuildings	Not Eligible
3060 S. 7200 W.	1946	Early Ranch residence (with garage) exhibiting general Post-WWII style; clad in drop siding and stone veneer; garage enclosed for living space; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
3075 S. 7200 W.	1932	Period Cottage exhibiting English Tudor and general Period Revival style; constructed of striated brick; excellent condition; original windows; historic landscape; two non-contributing outbuildings	Eligible under Criterion A
3080 S. 7200 W.	1940	WWII-Era Cottage exhibiting general 20th Century style; clad in medium-width aluminum/vinyl siding; windows replaced	Eligible under Criterion A
3104 S. 7200 W.	1894	Central Block with Projecting Bays residence exhibiting vernacular Victorian style; clad in wood sheet and Roman brick—major siding alteration; fenestration altered; two non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
3109 S. 7200 W.	1940	Residence of indeterminate type exhibiting general 20th Century style; clad in medium-width aluminum siding; windows replaced; one non-contributing outbuilding	Eligible under Criterion A

▲ ▲

Address ^a	Construction Date (Estimated)	Description	National Register Eligibility
3155 S. 7200 W.	1950	Early Ranch/Rambler residence exhibiting general Post-WWII and limited Minimal Traditional style; clad in narrow aluminum siding; windows replaced; four non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
3255 S. 7200 W.	1947	WWII-Era Cottage exhibiting general Post-WWII style; clad in narrow aluminum siding; windows replaced; large out-of-period rear addition; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
3302 S. 7200 W.	1955	WWII-Era Cottage of indeterminate style; clad in stone veneer and narrow aluminum siding; out-of-period bay window added to façade; out-of-period second-story addition over attached garage that has been enclosed for living space; no outbuildings	Not Eligible
3327 S. 7200 W.	1957	Ranch/Rambler residence exhibiting general Ranch/Rambler style; constructed of oversized brick; in-period (?) attached garage; full-length out-of-period porch with roof extension; out-of-period stone veneer; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
3329 S. 7200 W.	1956	Residence of undefined type and style; constructed of oversized brick and partially clad in narrow vinyl siding; two-story out-of-period addition; fenestration altered; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
3366 S. 7200 W.	1959	Ranch/Rambler residence exhibiting general Ranch/Rambler style; constructed of striated brick; garage addition; porch addition; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
3372 S. 7200 W.	1930	Residence of undefined type and general 20th Century and Minimal Traditional style; clad in stucco/plaster; small glass block window in façade may have been altered; two non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
3551 S. 7200 W.	1950	Early Ranch residence exhibiting Early Ranch style; constructed of striated brick; no notable alterations; two non-contributing outbuildings	Eligible under Criteria A and C
3563 S. 7200 W.	1943	Early Ranch of indeterminate style; clad in asbestos siding; porch enclosed; probable alteration of picture window in façade; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
3585 S. 7200 W.	1949	Late 20th Century residence of indeterminate style; clad in narrow vinyl siding; modern vinyl windows; large porch addition; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
3615 S. 7200 W.	1955	Late 20th Century residence of general Post-WWII style; clad in narrow vinyl siding; out-of-period addition; two non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
3621 S. 7200 W.	1955	Ranch/Rambler residence exhibiting general Ranch/Rambler style; constructed of oversized brick and partially clad in wood sheet; siding represents an alteration; out-of-period additions; fenestration altered; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
3641 S. 7200 W.	1955	Ranch/Rambler residence exhibiting general Ranch/Rambler style; constructed of striated brick; possible in-period garage addition; no outbuildings	Eligible under Criterion A

▼ ▼

Address ^a	Construction Date (Estimated)	Description	National Register Eligibility
3717 S. 7200 W.	1914	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow style; constructed of regular brick; dormer window covered; porch enclosed; windows replaced; no outbuildings	Eligible under Criterion A
3733 S. 7200 W.	1920	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow style; clad in modern brick veneer and vinyl siding resulting in major alteration of exterior appearance; fenestration altered—front door relocated; two non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
3775 S. 7200 W.	1920	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow style; clad in vinyl siding and stone veneer siding resulting in major alteration of exterior appearance; porch enclosed; two non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
5652 W. 13100 S.	1900/1945	Single Cell residence of general Early 20th Century style; clad in drop/novelty siding; abandoned but not notable alterations; may have been moved to this location; also present is a large, contributing, mid-20th-century agricultural/industrial building constructed of concrete block; one contributing grain silo is also present	Eligible under Criterion A
475 W. 14600 S.	1930	Residence of undefined type and general 20th Century style; clad in tongue-and-groove siding; alterations include the replacement of a few original windows with modern windows and possible porch and rear additions; one non-contributing outbuilding; this property is a unique type akin to a very early version of a Ranch/Rambler residence and is in generally good condition	Eligible under Criterion A
15286 S. Pony Express	1940	Residence of undefined type and general Post-WWII style; clad in stucco; alterations include the application of stucco and the addition of a large attached garage to the main façade; one non-contributing outbuilding and one contributing cistern	Not Eligible
15400 S. Pony Express	1945	Residence of undefined type and general Late 20th Century style; clad in vinyl siding; alterations include the application of vinyl siding, the replacement of original windows, and a probable porch addition; six contributing agricultural outbuildings are associated with this property	Not Eligible
16315 S. Camp Williams Rd.	1900	Large agricultural outbuilding/barn constructed of regular brick and exhibiting general Early 20th Century style; associated with out-of-period residence of Rustic style and Late 20th Century type; the barn has been slightly modified through the apparent adaptation of the structure for nonagricultural use, but it is still sufficiently intact to warrant consideration as a structure independent of the residence with which it is associated	Outbuilding Eligible under Criterion A
16575 S. Camp Williams Rd.	1910	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow style; clad in aluminum siding; alterations are extensive and consist of enclosure of the porch, structural additions, the construction of a post-1950s fireplace/chimney, and cladding of the structure in aluminum siding; former farmstead; one contributing and five non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible

^a A question mark (?) before an address indicates an estimated address.

^b See Calkins 2004.

17.2.2.2 Archaeological Sites

A total of 32 archaeological sites and segments of linear historic sites were identified within the impact analysis area in Salt Lake County (see Table 17.2-2 below). These sites are distributed roughly evenly throughout the survey areas and among the various alternatives. They consist of a variety of resources from prehistoric lithic scatters to historic artifact scatters to historic railroads, roads, and canals. Figure 17-5 through Figure 17-7, Architectural Properties, show the locations of linear historic sites; archaeological sites consisting of artifacts, such as prehistoric and historic items, are not shown on the figures in order to protect these resources and to comply with state and federal laws regarding the disclosure of site locations.

The railroads, roads, and canals are generally categorized as historic linear sites. Linear sites are most often documented in segments during individual project-specific surveys rather than in their entirety. For this reason, several segments of most linear sites in Salt Lake County have been previously documented for other projects.

NRHP evaluations associated with individual segments of linear sites are taken to apply to the entire site, not just the segment being documented. As a result of this, the majority of the linear sites that crossed the proposed alternatives had been previously evaluated for their eligibility for the NRHP. Additionally, the same linear site might cross several different alternatives or might cross a single alternative at several different locations. Therefore, several segments of many of the linear sites listed below in Table 17.2-2 were documented with the areas of the various alternatives surveyed for archaeological resources.

Of the 32 archaeological sites and segments of linear historic sites identified in Salt Lake County, 19 are considered to be eligible for the NRHP and 13 are considered to be ineligible. UDOT's and FHWA's determinations of eligibility were made in consultation with the Utah SHPO (see Appendix 17B, Cultural Resources Correspondence, for a copy of the signed Determination of Eligibility/Finding of Effect). Only those properties that are considered eligible for the NRHP need to be considered in terms of assessing impacts from the proposed alternatives.

Table 17.2-2. Archaeological Sites Associated with the Salt Lake County Alternatives

Site Number	Site Name (If Applicable)	Site Type	National Register Eligibility
42SL156	The Bingham Creek Site	Prehistoric camp and historic debris scatter	Eligible under Criterion D
42SL196	NA	Historic building foundation	Not Eligible
42SL214	Jordan and Salt Lake City Canal	Historic canal	Eligible under Criteria A and C
42SL266	Brighton Drain	Historic canal	Not Eligible
42SL267	C-7 Canal	Historic canal	Not Eligible
42SL273	Salt Lake to Tooele Highway	Historic road	Not Eligible
42SL274	Riter Canal	Historic canal	Eligible under Criterion A
42SL286 (see also 42UT946)	Utah Lake Distributing Canal	Canal	Eligible under Criterion A
42SL287 (see also 42UT947)	Provo Reservoir Canal/Murdock Ditch	Canal	Eligible under Criterion A
42SL290	East Jordan Canal	Historic canal	Eligible under Criterion A
42SL291	South Jordan Canal	Historic canal	Eligible under Criterion A
42SL293 (see also 42UT1125)	Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad—mainline	Historic railroad	Eligible under Criterion A
42SL295	Utah and Salt Lake Canal	Historic canal	Eligible under Criterion A
42SL300	Union Pacific	Historic railroad	Eligible under Criteria A and B
42SL304	West Branch Brighton Canal Extension	Historic canal	Eligible under Criterion A
42SL305	Ridgeland Canal	Historic canal	Eligible under Criterion A
42SL306	Salt Lake Garfield and Western Railroad	Historic railroad	Eligible under Criterion A
42SL333	Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad—Garfield Branch	Historic railroad	Eligible under Criterion A
42SL334	Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad—Garfield Branch, Bacchus Spur	Historic railroad	Not Eligible
42SL335	Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad—Bingham Branch	Historic railroad	Eligible under Criterion A
42SL337	Western Pacific	Historic railroad	Eligible under Criterion A
42SL350	Draper Irrigation Canal	Historic canal	Eligible under Criterion A
42SL384	Bingham and Garfield Railway	Historic railroad	Eligible under Criteria A and B
42SL510	Salt Lake and Utah Railroad	Historic railroad	Eligible under Criteria A and B

▲ ▲

Site Number	Site Name (If Applicable)	Site Type	National Register Eligibility
42SL569	NA	Prehistoric lithic scatter	Not Eligible
42SL570	NA	Historic debris scatter	Not Eligible
42SL571	NA	Historic habitation	Not Eligible
42SL572	NA	Historic debris scatter	Not Eligible
42SL573	NA	Historic debris scatter	Not Eligible
42SL574	NA	Historic utility line	Not Eligible
42SL575	NA	Historic debris scatter	Not Eligible
42SL576	NA	Historic debris scatter	Not Eligible

17.2.2.3 Paleontological Localities

No previously documented or newly identified paleontological localities were identified within the impact analysis area in Salt Lake County.

17.2.3 Resources in Utah County

The literature reviews, consultation, and field inspections identified historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources within the impact analysis area in Utah County. These resources range from prehistoric and historic archaeological sites to historic canals and railroads to architectural properties. No paleontological resources were identified within the impact analysis area in Utah County.

17.2.3.1 Architectural Properties

A total of 40 architectural properties were identified within the impact analysis area in Utah County (see Table 17.2-3 below). These properties, most of which are residential, include properties from the late 1800s to the middle 20th century. The properties were identified throughout the area south and west of Lehi and in extreme western American Fork. The properties did not occur in any particular clusters, primarily because the alternatives generally cut across north-south roadways rather than paralleling them.

Of the 40 architectural properties identified in Utah County, 12 are considered to be eligible for the NRHP and 28 are considered to be ineligible. The locations of the eligible properties are shown in Figure 17-8 through Figure 17-10, Architectural Properties. UDOT's and FHWA's NRHP eligibility determinations were made in consultation with the Utah SHPO (see Appendix 17B, Cultural Resources Correspondence, for a copy of the signed Determination of Eligibility/Finding of Effect).

▼ ▼

Table 17.2-3. Architectural Properties Associated with the Utah County Alternatives

Address ^a	Construction Date (Estimated)	Description	National Register Eligibility
71307 W. 2100 N.	1910	Residence of undefined type and vernacular Victorian style; clad in drop siding and stucco/plaster; possible former Hall-Parlor; fenestration altered; out-of-period addition; four contributing outbuildings and one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
870 W. State St.	1917	Cross-wing residence with limited general Victorian and extensive Late 20th Century stylistic elements; clad in stucco and aluminum siding; all original windows replaced; major exterior remodel; multiple out-of-period additions; no outbuildings	Not Eligible
894 W. State St.	1941	Period Cottage of limited Period Revival style and Late 20th Century style; clad in aluminum siding with some original striated brick showing; original windows replaced; major siding change; metal roof; large wheelchair ramp added to primary façade; no outbuildings	Not Eligible
1000 W. State St.	1925	Bungalow residence of general Bungalow style; clad in tongue-and-groove and aluminum siding; alterations include the use of aluminum siding and possible alteration of the fenestration in the gable of the front façade; one contributing outbuilding (garage)	Not Eligible
1020 W. State St.	1941	Period Cottage/WWII-Era Cottage transitional residence of general Late 20th Century style; clad in striated brick and wood sheet; alterations include the replacement of original windows and a minor siding change	Eligible under Criterion A
1024 W. State St.	1958	Ranch/Rambler residence of general Post-WWII style; clad in oversized brick; alterations include a large side addition with a carport and garage attachment and replacement of the original windows; no outbuildings	Not Eligible
1025 W. State St.	1958	Service bay business of Post-WWII and Contemporary style; clad in stone veneer and aluminum siding; some original windows and bay doors replaced; one non-contributing outbuilding	Eligible under Criterion A
1060 W. State St.	1947	Period Cottage/WWII-Era Cottage transitional residence of simplified Minimal Traditional and Period Revival style; clad in striated brick; alterations include the replacement of original windows and the application of 1950s window and porch awnings; one contributing outbuilding (garage) and one non-contributing outbuilding	Eligible under Criterion A
931 W. 2100 N.	1945	WWII-Era Cottage of Minimal Traditional style; clad in narrow vinyl siding; large probable out-of-period side addition alters massing; most windows replaced; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
951 W. 2100 N.	1937	Possible late-period Foursquare residence with a 1950s side addition; building exhibits elements of Early 20th Century and Post-WWII style; clad in hard board siding; some windows replaced; original entry relocated to addition; one non-contributing outbuilding	Eligible under Criterion A

▲ ▲

Address ^a	Construction Date (Estimated)	Description	National Register Eligibility
957 W. 2100 N.	1954	Other residential building with probable out-of-period addition creating a Split Level residence of general Ranch/Rambler style; clad in wide aluminum siding, tongue-and-groove siding, and textured brick; some windows replaced; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
959 W. 2100 N.	1940	WWII-Era Cottage of Minimal Traditional style; clad in striated brick and vinyl siding; probable out-of-period rear addition, but it is clearly distinguishable from the original building; some windows replaced; one non-contributing outbuilding	Eligible under Criterion A
1985 N. 900 W.	1945	Other residential building of Late 20th Century style; clad in oversized brick; all windows replaced; cladding appears to be modern; large corrugated metal rear addition; no outbuildings	Not Eligible
1955 N. Railroad St.	1950	Early Ranch residence of Early Ranch style; clad in narrow aluminum siding; detached garage attached by enclosure of breezeway and garage enclosed for living space; probable window opening enclosed in primary façade; most windows replaced; no outbuildings	Not Eligible
?10400 W. 8170 N.	1950	WWII-Era Cottage exhibiting general Post-WWII style; clad in wood sheet and aluminum siding; windows replaced; medium-width siding; rear addition; no outbuildings	Not Eligible
?10000 W. 8170 N.	1940	Agricultural sheds constructed of wood frame and plank siding; only historic component of modern turkey farm; over 25 non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
7944 N. 9550 W.	1910	Bungalow residence exhibiting general Bungalow and Colonial Revival style; constructed of rock-faced concrete block and partially clad in vinyl siding; windows replaced; three non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
?905 S. 1700 W.	1950	Agricultural shed of undefined style; constructed of wood frame and clad in corrugated metal; one riveted steel tank and one out-of-period metal silo are also present; agricultural buildings only; poor condition	Eligible under Criterion A
7935 N. 8730 W.	1935	Residence of indeterminate type exhibiting Colonial Revival style; clad in aluminum/vinyl siding; out-of-period side addition; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
?7740 N. 8730 W.	1930	Inside-out granary and two wood-plank sheds; agricultural outbuildings only	Eligible under Criterion A
?7410 N. 8350 W.	1915	Bungalow residence of Bungalow and simplified Victorian style; clad in rock-faced concrete block and medium-width aluminum siding; alterations include the use of aluminum siding and the replacement of some original windows; one contributing outbuilding (barn) and one non-contributing outbuilding	Eligible under Criterion A
7770 N. 8350 W.	1887	Cross-Wing residence of vernacular Victorian style; clad in wood sheet; alterations include extensive use of wood-sheet cladding and replacement of original windows with vinyl-coated aluminum-frame windows; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible

▼ ▼

Address ^a	Construction Date (Estimated)	Description	National Register Eligibility
?7785 N. 8350 W.	1920	Bungalow residence of general Bungalow style; clad in vinyl siding; alterations include the extensive use of vinyl siding and the replacement of original windows with vinyl-coated aluminum windows; one contributing outbuilding (barn) and five non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
?7915 N. 8350 W.	1890	Ruins of Single Cell building constructed of adobe brick and drop siding; ruins exhibit limited Prairie School style elements; log-structure ruins in association	Not Eligible
7900 N. 8350 W.	1890	Two-story Hall-Parlor residence of vernacular Gothic Revival style; clad in wide aluminum siding; some original windows, some storm windows over originals; rare building type in outskirts of Lehi; two non-contributing outbuildings	Eligible under Criterion A
7491 W. Millpond Rd.	1955	Ranch/Rambler residence exhibiting general Post-WWII style; clad in wood sheet and medium-width aluminum siding; out-of-period side addition; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
7505 W. Millpond Rd.	1930	Residence of indeterminate type exhibiting general 20th Century style; clad in modern brick and stucco/plaster—major exterior alteration; metal roof; out-of-period garage addition; three non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
1100 W. Main St.	1935	Period Cottage residence exhibiting general Period Revival style; constructed of regular brick; clay tile roof; some windows replaced; six non-contributing outbuildings	Eligible under Criterion A
1041 W. Main St.	1942	WWII-Era Cottage residence of indeterminate style; clad in aluminum/vinyl siding; fenestration altered; porch addition; out-of-period addition; four non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
?7105 N. Saratoga Rd.	1905	Hall-Parlor residence of unclear style; clad in narrow vinyl siding; original windows replaced with modern vinyl windows; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
7364 N. 9550 W.	1937	WWII-Era Cottage of limited Minimal Traditional style; clad in narrow aluminum siding; modern storm windows obscure original windows; three non-contributing outbuildings	Eligible under Criterion A
9520 W. 7350 N.	1905	Foursquare residence of indeterminate style; clad in narrow aluminum siding; windows replaced; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
7086 W. 7750 N.	1947	Early Ranch/Rambler residence of general Ranch/Rambler style; clad in striated brick; alterations include a large, attached garage addition, application of a clay tile roof, and a large side addition; one non-contributing outbuilding	Not Eligible
?7122 W. 7750 N.	1955	Ranch/Rambler residence of general Ranch/Rambler style; clad in striated brick; alterations include the application of a clay tile roof and the replacement of original windows; four non-contributing outbuildings	Eligible under Criterion A
?7800 W. 7750 N.	1930	Loafing shed, agricultural outbuildings only; wood frame with plank siding; poor to fair condition; possibly relocated to present site	Not Eligible

▲ ▲

Address ^a	Construction Date (Estimated)	Description	National Register Eligibility
7500 N. 7230 W.	1949	Ranch/Rambler residence of general Post-WWII style; clad in synthetic stucco; Spanish tile roof; no outbuildings	Not Eligible
6625 N. 5750 W.	1935	Period Cottage residence of general Period Revival and 20th Century style; clad in drop siding; multiple out-of-period additions; fenestration altered; modern vinyl windows; three non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
6535 N. 5750 W.	1935	Bungalow residence exhibiting Late 20th Century style; clad in vinyl siding; major exterior renovation—siding, two-story out-of-period addition, modern windows; two non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
?5155 W. 600 N.	1930	Residence of indeterminate type and style; clad in drop siding and Roman brick; siding alteration; two-story out-of-period addition; modern vinyl windows; four non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible
7761 S. State Route (SR) 68	1915	Bungalow residence of Arts and Crafts style; clad in striated brick and concrete block; alterations are fairly extensive and include enclosure of the front porch and modification of the front entry—the front entry no longer exists; three non-contributing outbuildings	Not Eligible

^a A question mark (?) before an address indicates an estimated address.

17.2.3.2 Archaeological Sites

A total of nine archaeological sites and segments of linear historic sites were identified within the impact analysis area in Utah County (see Table 17.2-4 below). These sites are distributed roughly evenly throughout the survey areas and among the various alternatives. They consist of an array of resources from prehistoric lithic scatters to historic artifact scatters to historic railroads, roads, and canals.

The railroads, roads, and canals are generally categorized as historic linear sites. Linear sites are most often documented in segments during individual project-specific surveys rather than in their entirety. For this reason, several segments of most linear sites in Utah County have been previously documented for other projects.

NRHP evaluations associated with individual segments of linear sites are taken to apply to the entire site, not just the segment being documented. As a result of this, the majority of the linear sites that crossed the proposed alternatives had been previously evaluated for their eligibility for the NRHP. Additionally, the same linear site cross several different alternatives or might cross a single alternative at several different locations. Therefore, several segments of many of the linear sites listed in Table 17.2-4 below were documented within the areas of the various alternatives surveyed for archaeological resources.

▼ ▼

Table 17.2-4. Archaeological Sites within the Utah County Alternatives

Site No.	Site Name (if applicable)	Site Type	National Register Eligibility
42UT944	Gardner Canal	Canal	Eligible under Criterion A
42UT945	Saratoga Canal	Canal	Eligible under Criterion A
42UT946 (see also 42SL286)	Utah Lake Distributing Canal	Canal	Eligible under Criterion A
42UT947 (see also 42SL287)	Provo Reservoir Canal/Murdock Ditch	Canal	Eligible under Criterion A
42UT948	Salt Lake and Western Railway (also known as Salt Lake Western Railroad)	Historic railroad	Eligible under Criterion A
42UT1125 (see also 42SL293)	Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad – mainline	Historic railroad	Eligible under Criterion A
42UT1439	NA	Historic debris scatter	Not Eligible
42UT1440	NA	Prehistoric lithic scatter	Not Eligible
42UT1441	NA	Historic structure	Not Eligible

Of the nine archaeological sites and segments of linear historic sites identified in Utah County, six are considered eligible for the NRHP and three are considered ineligible. UDOT's and FHWA's determinations of eligibility were made in consultation with the Utah SHPO (see Appendix 17B, Cultural Resources Correspondence, for a copy of the signed Determination of Eligibility/Finding of Effect). Given the sensitive nature of location information for archaeological resources, and in accordance with state and federal legislation regarding this issue, no maps are provided in this EIS that identify the locations of the sites found during the field surveys.

17.2.3.3 Multiple Property Submission: *The Historical Agricultural Landscape of Northern Utah County*

Unlike other areas through which the proposed MVC alternatives would pass, the northern Utah County area is largely characterized by an agricultural landscape consisting of features such as open fields, farmsteads, irrigation canals, field ditches, and transportation systems. Many of these features and the overall agricultural landscape have their origins in the historical period. The approximate boundaries for which the Multiple Property Submission (MPS) was developed extend south from the Utah County–Salt Lake County line to the Pleasant Grove city boundaries east to Interstate 15 (I-15) and west to the foothills above Saratoga Springs.

In recognition of this landscape, an NRHP MPS form was prepared that identified the types of sites and features that are typically found in historical



agricultural landscapes and established criteria by which individual examples of these sites and features could be evaluated for their historical significance and eligibility for listing on the NRHP. In essence, the MPS establishes a context for considering historical elements of the agricultural landscape and functions as a tool for evaluating the importance of those elements. The overall landscape described in the MPS is not a cultural resource in itself. However, individual elements of the MPS landscape, such as several of the irrigation canals and farmsteads discussed in Sections 17.2.3.1 and 17.2.3.2, are considered cultural resources. Secondary and tertiary irrigation ditches (small, unnamed field ditches) are also part of the MPS landscape but were not treated as individual cultural resource sites as part of the studies for the MVC EIS.

17.2.3.4 Paleontological Localities

No previously documented or newly identified paleontological localities were identified within the impact analysis area in Utah County.

17.3 Environmental Consequences

17.3.1 Methodology

This section describes the methodology for assessing impacts to historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources from the proposed alternatives. The resources described in Section 17.2.2, Resources in Salt Lake County, and Section 17.2.3, Resources in Utah County, that are considered to be eligible for the NRHP were assessed to determine whether any of the action alternatives would affect any portion of the resource. For NRHP-eligible architectural and archaeological properties, an impact was considered likely if any portion of the primary building, contributing outbuilding(s), historically associated lands, or site features and artifacts was found within the area of potential effects. Next, the nature and extent of that impact on the characteristics of the property or site that make it eligible for the NRHP under a particular criterion were assessed. If the important characteristics would be altered so that some portion of the property's or site's eligibility was affected, an adverse impact was considered likely.

Because no known paleontological resources were identified within the area of potential effects for the proposed alternatives, no analysis of specific paleontological localities was conducted. For this reason, the impacts to paleontological resources from each alternative are discussed in general terms and take into account the potential to discover paleontological localities during construction of the project.



The following sections summarize the impacts to known historic and archaeological resources from each proposed alternative and combination of alternatives. Impacts are limited to the construction phase of the project. The discussion of impacts is arranged first by county and then by individual alternative. Details regarding the specific impacts on individual properties and sites can be found at the end of this chapter. Appendix 17B, Cultural Resources Correspondence, contains the Utah SHPO–approved Determination of Eligibility/Finding of Effect for the MVC project.

Potential indirect and secondary impacts are analyzed in Chapter 24, Indirect Effects. No significant cumulative impact issues were identified for historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources (see Chapter 25, Cumulative Impacts, for the rationale for analyzing specific resources).

17.3.2 No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, the MVC project would not be constructed, so no impacts to historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources would occur as a result of the MVC project. Other transportation projects identified in the long-range plans from the Wasatch Front Regional Council and the Mountainland Association of Governments and by the local communities would be constructed, and these projects could cause impacts to historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources.

17.3.3 Salt Lake County Alternatives

In Salt Lake County, two roadway alternatives and a transit alternative which would be implemented as part of the roadway alternatives are under consideration: the 5600 West Transit Alternative, the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, and the 7200 West Freeway Alternative. Under the 5600 West Transit Alternative, there is a dedicated right-of-way option and a mixed-traffic option. In addition, a tolling option was considered for each freeway alternative. Because the tolling option would occupy the same area of disturbance as the freeway alternatives, the tolling option would have impacts identical to the freeway alternatives as described in subsequent sections of this chapter. Impacts under each combination of alternatives and options are discussed in the following sections.

17.3.3.1 5600 West Transit Alternative

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, two transit options are under consideration along 5600 West in Salt Lake County. One option, the Dedicated Right-of-Way Option, would incorporate a transit system running down the center of the roadway, and the other, the Mixed-Traffic Option, would

incorporate a transit system running alongside the roadway. Each system would cause different impacts to historic, archaeological, and/or paleontological resources.

5600 West Transit Alternative Impacts				
Impacts	Dedicated Right-of-Way Option		Mixed-Traffic Option	
	Architectural Properties	Archaeological Sites	Architectural Properties	Archaeological Sites
No Adverse Effect	12	8	7	8
Adverse Effect	0	0	0	0
Total	12	8	7	8

5600 West Transit Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option

Under this option, the transit system would require the acquisition and development of additional right-of-way at station and park-and-ride lot locations and along cross-country segments of the proposed transit line. As a result of this acquisition and development, there would be impacts to 12 known NRHP-eligible architectural properties and eight known NRHP-eligible archaeological sites. None of the architectural properties or archaeological sites would be affected to such a degree that the effects would be considered adverse under the National Historic Preservation Act. No known paleontological localities would be affected (see Table 17A-1, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the 5600 West Transit Dedicated Right-of-Way Alternative, in Appendix 17A, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the Project). Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, provides the details (including illustrations) of the adverse impacts to the architectural properties.

5600 West Transit Alternative with Mixed-Traffic Transit Option

This option would require the acquisition and development of additional right-of-way for park-and-ride lots and along the cross-country segments of the proposed transit line. As a result of this acquisition and development, there would be impacts to seven known NRHP-eligible architectural properties and eight known NRHP-eligible archaeological sites. None of these affected resources would be adversely affected (see Table 17A-2, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the 5600 West Transit Mixed-Traffic Alternative, in Appendix 17A, NRHP-Eligible

Resources Affected by the Project). No known paleontological localities would be affected. Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, provides the details (including illustrations) of the adverse impacts to the architectural properties.

17.3.3.2 5800 West Freeway Alternative

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, this alternative would consist of a freeway extending from Interstate 80 (I-80) to the Utah County line.

5800 West Freeway Alternative Impacts		
Impacts	Architectural Properties	Archaeological Sites
No Adverse Effect	0	9
Adverse Effect	11	1
Total	11	10

This alternative would affect 11 known NRHP-eligible architectural properties and 10 known NRHP-eligible archaeological sites. Of these 21 resources, a total of 12 (all 11 architectural properties and one archaeological site) would be adversely affected (see Table 17A-3, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, in Appendix 17A, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the Project). Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, provides the details (including illustrations) of the adverse impacts to the architectural properties.

No known paleontological localities would be affected. Given the high level of ground disturbance associated with this alternative, additional subsurface archaeological or paleontological resources could be discovered during construction.

Combined Impacts of 5800 West Freeway and 5600 West Transit Alternatives

The 5800 West Freeway Alternative would be implemented with one of the two 5600 West Transit Alternative options. The combination of the freeway alternative with each of the transit options would cause different impacts to NRHP-eligible resources and/or paleontological resources.

Combined Impacts of 5800 West Freeway and 5600 West Transit Alternatives				
Impacts	Dedicated Right-of-Way Option		Mixed-Traffic Option	
	Architectural Properties	Archaeological Sites	Architectural Properties	Archaeological Sites
No Adverse Effect	12	17	7	17
Adverse Effect	11	1	11	1
Total	23	18	18	18

5800 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option

This combination of alternative and transit option would affect 41 NRHP-eligible resources, including multiple segments of the same linear historical sites, and would cause adverse impacts to 12 of these resources (11 architectural properties and one archaeological site) (see Table 17A-1, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the 5600 West Transit Dedicated Right-of-Way Alternative, and Table 17A-3, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, in Appendix 17A, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the Project). Impacts to all 11 of the architectural properties would result in demolition of the primary building and a full or substantive acquisition of the associated property. Impacts to the archaeological site could alter or damage undiscovered subsurface deposits and features of the site that contribute to the site's eligibility for the NRHP under Criterion D. These adverse effects could be mitigated through data recovery or other means. Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, provides the details (including illustrations) of the adverse impacts to the architectural properties.

5800 West Freeway Alternative with Mixed-Traffic Transit Option

This combination of alternative and transit option would affect 36 NRHP-eligible resources, including multiple segments of the same linear historical sites. This combination would have the same adverse impacts as the combination of the freeway and the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option (adverse impacts to 11 architectural properties and one archaeological site) (see Table 17A-2, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the 5600 West Transit Mixed-Traffic Alternative, and Table 17A-3, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, in Appendix 17A, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the Project). Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, provides the details (including illustrations) of the adverse impacts to the architectural properties.

5800 West Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option

Under the 5800 West Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option, the overall facility design would not change compared to the non-tolled alternative, so impacts to cultural and paleontological resources would be the same as those from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative.

17.3.3.3 7200 West Freeway Alternative

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, this alternative would consist of a freeway extending from I-80 to the Utah County line.

7200 West Freeway Alternative Impacts		
Impacts	Architectural Properties	Archaeological Sites
No Adverse Effect	0	8
Adverse Effect	5	1
Total	5	9

This alternative would affect five known NRHP-eligible architectural properties and nine known NRHP-eligible archaeological sites. Of these 15 resources, a total of six (all five architectural properties and one archaeological site) would be adversely affected (see Table 17A-4, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the 7200 West Freeway Alternative, in Appendix 17A, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the Project). Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, provides the details (including illustrations) of the adverse impacts to the architectural properties.

No known paleontological localities would be affected. Given the high level of ground disturbance associated with this alternative, additional subsurface archaeological or paleontological resources could be discovered during construction.

Combined Impacts of 7200 West Freeway and 5600 West Transit Alternatives

As with the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, the 7200 West Freeway Alternative would be implemented with one of the two 5600 West Transit Alternative options. The combination of the freeway alternative with each of the transit options would cause different impacts to NRHP-eligible resources and/or paleontological resources.

Combined Impacts of 7200 West Freeway and 5600 West Transit Alternatives				
Impacts	Dedicated Right-of-Way Option		Mixed-Traffic Option	
	Architectural Properties	Archaeological Sites	Architectural Properties	Archaeological Sites
No Adverse Effect	12	16	7	16
Adverse Effect	5	1	5	1
Total	17	17	12	17

7200 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option

This combination of alternative and transit option would affect 34 NRHP-eligible resources, including multiple segments of the same linear historical sites. The combination would cause adverse impacts to seven of these resources (five architectural properties and one archaeological site) (see Table 17A-1, NRHP-

Eligible Resources Affected by the 5600 West Transit Dedicated Right-of-Way Alternative, and Table 17A-4, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the 7200 West Freeway Alternative, in Appendix 17A, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the Project). Impacts to the architectural properties would result in demolition of the primary building and a full or substantive acquisition of the associated property. Impacts to the remaining property would leave the primary buildings intact but would take contributing features (historical landscaping) of the associated property and would alter the setting and feeling of the resource. Impacts to the archaeological site could alter or damage undiscovered subsurface deposits and features of the site that contribute to the site's eligibility for the NRHP under Criterion D. These adverse effects could be mitigated through data recovery or other means. Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, provides the details (including illustrations) of the adverse impacts to the architectural properties.

7200 West Freeway Alternative with Mixed-Traffic Transit Option

This combination of alternative and transit option would affect 29 NRHP-eligible resources, including multiple segments of the same linear historical sites. This combination would have the same adverse impacts as the combination of the freeway and the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option (adverse impacts to five architectural properties and one archaeological site) (see Table 17A-2, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the 5600 West Transit Mixed-Traffic Alternative, and Table 17A-4, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the 7200 West Freeway Alternative, in Appendix 17A, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the Project). Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, provides the details (including illustrations) of the adverse impacts to the architectural properties.

7200 West Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option

Under the 7200 West Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option, the overall facility design would not change compared to the non-tolled alternative, so impacts to cultural and paleontological resources would be the same as those from the 7200 West Freeway Alternative.

17.3.4 Utah County Alternatives

In Utah County, three alternatives are under consideration: the Southern Freeway Alternative, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, and the Arterials Alternative. In addition, a tolling option was evaluated for each Utah County alternative. Impacts under each combination of alternatives and options are discussed in the following sections.

Impacts on resources that are considered to meet the registration criteria in the MPS for the historical agricultural landscape of the Utah County portion of the impact analysis area are also evaluated. Note that such resources can include farmstead buildings, archaeological sites such as canals and railroads, and landscape features such as secondary and tertiary irrigation ditches. In the followings sections, summary totals that are given for MPS components can include buildings, canals, and railroads that are also counted under the categories of architectural properties and archaeological sites.

17.3.4.1 Southern Freeway Alternative

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, this alternative would consist of a freeway extending from the Utah County line to I-15 at Lindon.

Southern Freeway Alternative Impacts			
Impacts	Architectural Properties	Archaeological Sites	MPS Components
No Adverse Effect	0	4	6
Adverse Effect	1	1	1
Total	1	5	7

This alternative would affect one NRHP-eligible architectural property and five known NRHP-eligible archaeological sites. Of these six resources, two would be adversely affected, including one architectural property and one archaeological site (see Table 17A-5, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the Southern Freeway Alternative, in Appendix 17A, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the Project). Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, provides the details (including illustrations) of the adverse impacts to the architectural properties.

No known paleontological localities would be affected. Given the high level of ground disturbance associated with this alternative, additional subsurface archaeological or paleontological resources could be discovered during construction. A high density of archaeological sites has been identified along the shoreline of Utah Lake through studies conducted by Brigham Young University. The potential for this alternative to encounter subsurface resources during construction is considered moderate given its proximity to the lake shore.

This alternative would also affect several contributing or independently eligible components of the *Historical Agricultural Landscape of Northern Utah County*. These components include sections of four contributing secondary/tertiary ditches, sections of two primary canals (sites 42UT946 and 42UT947), and a section of one railroad/circulation network site (42UT1125). Of these resources, only one secondary/tertiary ditch would be adversely affected.

Southern Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option

Under the Southern Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option, the overall facility design would not change compared to the non-tolled alternative, so impacts to cultural and paleontological resources would be the same as those from the Southern Freeway Alternative.

17.3.4.2 2100 North Freeway Alternative

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, this alternative would consist of a freeway extending from the Utah

2100 North Freeway Alternative Impacts			
Impacts	Architectural Properties	Archaeological Sites	MPS Components
No Adverse Effect	2	5	3
Adverse Effect	3	1	1
Total	5	6	4

County line to State Route (SR) 73 in Saratoga Springs and a lateral freeway extending east along 2100 North to I-15 in Lehi.

This alternative would affect five known NRHP-eligible architectural properties and six known NRHP-eligible archaeological sites. Of these 11 resources, a total of four (three architectural properties and one archaeological site) would be adversely affected (see Table 17A-6, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the 2100 North Freeway, in Appendix 17A, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the Project). Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, provides the details (including illustrations) of the adverse impacts to the architectural properties.

No known paleontological localities would be affected. Given the high level of ground disturbance associated with this alternative, additional subsurface archaeological or paleontological resources could be discovered during construction.

This alternative would also affect several contributing or independently eligible components of the *Historical Agricultural Landscape of Northern Utah County*. These components include sections of one contributing secondary/tertiary ditch, sections of three primary canals (sites 42UT944, 42UT946, and 42UT947), and a

section of one railroad/circulation network site (42UT1125). One of these resources, the secondary/tertiary irrigation ditch, would be adversely affected by this alternative.

2100 North Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option

Under the 2100 North Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option, the overall facility design would not change compared to the non-tolled alternative, so impacts to cultural and paleontological resources would be the same as those from the 2100 North Freeway Alternative.

17.3.4.3 Arterials Alternative

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, this alternative would consist of a series of arterial roadways

Arterials Alternative Impacts			
Impacts	Architectural Properties	Archaeological Sites	MPS Components
No Adverse Effect	2	12	7
Adverse Effect	3	2	2
Total	5	14	9

throughout northern Utah County. The combination of arterials includes a freeway segment from the Utah County line to SR 73 and arterial roadways at Porter Rockwell Boulevard, 2100 North, and 1900 South.

This alternative would affect five NRHP-eligible architectural properties and 14 known NRHP-eligible archaeological sites. Of these 19 resources, a total of five (three architectural properties and two primary irrigation canals) would be adversely affected (see Table 17A-7, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the Arterials Alternative, in Appendix 17A, NRHP-Eligible Resources Affected by the Project). Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, provides the details (including illustrations) of the adverse impacts to the architectural properties.

No known paleontological localities would be affected. Given the high level of ground disturbance associated with this alternative, additional subsurface archaeological or paleontological resources could be discovered during construction.

This alternative would also affect several contributing or independently eligible components of the *Historical Agricultural Landscape of Northern Utah County*. These components include sections of five contributing secondary/tertiary ditches, sections of three primary canals (sites 42UT944, 42UT946, and 42UT947), and a section of one railroad/circulation network site (42UT1125).

▲ ▲

Two of these resources, both secondary/tertiary irrigation ditches, would be adversely affected by this alternative.

Arterials Alternative with Tolling Option

Under the Arterials Alternative with Tolling Option, the overall facility design would not change compared to the non-tolled alternative, so impacts to cultural and paleontological resources would be the same as those from the Arterials Alternative.

17.3.5 Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are not yet developed. They will result from a Programmatic Agreement or Memorandum of Agreement that will be negotiated with the Utah SHPO prior to the Record of Decision for the project (see Section 17.2.1.4, Next Steps).

17.3.6 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts were analyzed for local and regionally important issues (farmlands, air quality, water quality, and ecosystems) as developed with resource agencies and the public during scoping. See Chapter 25, Cumulative Impacts, for a more detailed discussion of cumulative impacts.

17.3.7 Summary of Impacts

Table 17.3-1 below summarizes the impacts from each combination of alternatives and options in Salt Lake County and Utah County.

▼ ▼



Table 17.3-1. Summary of Impacts to Cultural Resources

Alternative ^a	Architectural Properties		Archaeological Sites		MPS Components		
	No Adverse Effects	Adverse Effects	No Adverse Effects	Adverse Effects	No Adverse Effects	Adverse Effects	Total Adverse Effects
<i>5800 West Freeway / 5600 West Transit / Southern Freeway</i>							
Dedicated Transit	12	12	21	2	6	1	15
Mixed Transit	7	12	21	2	6	1	15
<i>5800 West Freeway / 5600 West Transit / 2100 North Freeway</i>							
Dedicated Transit	14	14	22	2	3	1	18
Mixed Transit	9	14	22	2	3	1	18
<i>5800 West Freeway / 5600 West Transit / Arterials</i>							
Dedicated Transit	14	14	29	3	7	2	19
Mixed Transit	9	14	29	3	7	2	19
<i>7200 West Freeway / 5600 West Transit / Southern Freeway</i>							
Dedicated Transit	12	6	20	2	6	1	10
Mixed Transit	7	6	20	2	6	1	10
<i>7200 West Freeway / 5600 West Transit / 2100 North Freeway</i>							
Dedicated Transit	14	8	21	2	3	1	13
Mixed Transit	9	8	21	2	3	1	13
<i>7200 West Freeway / 5600 West Transit / Arterials</i>							
Dedicated Transit	14	8	28	3	7	2	14
Mixed Transit	9	8	28	3	7	2	14

The results in the table summarize the combined total impact for both the Salt Lake County and Utah County alternatives. The total impact includes both roadway and transit.

^a Dedicated Transit = Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option; Mixed Transit = Mixed-Traffic Transit Option



▲ ▲

17.4 References

Calkins, N.

- 2004 Selective Reconnaissance Survey, West Valley City and Magna, Salt Lake County, Utah. Nancy Calkins, Historic Preservation Consultant, Salt Lake City.

Easton, C., W. Stokes, and A. Hutchinson

- 2005 *A Class III Cultural Resource Inventory for the Proposed Mountain View Corridor Project, Salt Lake and Utah Counties, Utah*. SWCA, Inc. Environmental Consultants, Salt Lake City.

Ellis, S.M.

- 2006a *Addendum to a Selective Reconnaissance-Level Architectural Properties Survey for the Mountain View Corridor Project, Northern Utah County, Utah*. SWCA, Inc. Environmental Consultants, Salt Lake City.
- 2006b *Addendum to a Selective Reconnaissance-Level Architectural Properties Survey for the Mountain View Corridor Project, Western Salt Lake County, Utah*. SWCA, Inc. Environmental Consultants, Salt Lake City.
- 2007a *A Selective Reconnaissance-Level Architectural Properties Survey for the Mountain View Corridor Project, Western Salt Lake County, Utah*. SWCA, Inc. Environmental Consultants, Salt Lake City.
- 2007b *A Selective Reconnaissance-Level Architectural Properties Survey for the Mountain View Corridor Project, Northern Utah County, Utah*. SWCA, Inc. Environmental Consultants, Salt Lake City.

Molenaar, M.

- 2006 Native American Contacts and Identification of Traditional Cultural Properties for the Mountain View Corridor Project. Summit Ethnographic Solutions, Park City.

▼ ▼